UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/500,702	02/09/2000	Phillipe Cailloux	17356-703	2977

24394 7590 12/10/2004

LARIVIERE, GRUBMAN & PAYNE, LLP
19 UPPER RAGSDALE DRIVE
SUITE 200
MONTEREY, CA 93940

EXAMINER	
JANKUS, ALMIS R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2671	12

DATE MAILED: 12/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/500,702	Applicant(s) CAILLOUX ET AL.	
	Examiner Almis R Jankus	Art Unit 2671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13 and 15-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-13 and 23-26* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *15,16 and 18-22* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *17* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 February 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-13 and 15-26 are presented for examination.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Watt et al.

With respect to claim 15 Watt et al. teach the claimed method selecting a start character, wherein the start character is selected from a plurality of characters in a font family, at page 413 figure 17.17, the letter "E" at the top left corner corresponding to the claimed start character; selecting an end character from the font family, at page 413 figure 17.17, the letter "Z" at the bottom right corner corresponding to the claimed end character, the font family being an unprocessed font as disclosed in the instant specification at page 30, the plurality of characters being at least the letters "E" and "Z"; accessing a data structure for the font family, at page 413 left column, the data structure

comprising piecewise Bezier curves with appropriate continuity constraints; the data structure containing an inter-morphing sequence for each pair of characters in the font family, such that the inter-morphing sequence for the start character and the end character is selected from the data structure, at page 413 figure 17.17, the inter-morphing sequence being the 10 characters not including the start and end characters, the selection being taught at page 413 left column.

Claim 16 further requires morphing the start character into the end character according to the inter-morphing sequence for the start character and the end character. Watt et al. Teach this at page 413 and at figure 17.17.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of

each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 18, 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McReynolds in view of Des Jardins.

With respect to claim 18, McReynolds teaches the claimed method of generating a motion-blur effect in an animated character, wherein the animated character is displayed in a sequence of frames on a computer screen, the method comprising: selecting a frame from the sequence of frames, at page 83 section 9.1 with the teaching of rendering a frame of an animation sequence (the frame must be inherently selected for it to be rendered); taking a plurality of sample images for the frame, at page 83 section 9.1 with the teaching of rendering the scene (first sample) without the moving object, using glAccum(GL_LOAD, .5f) and accumulating the scene 10 more times (10 more samples) with the moving object; selecting a display feature of the character for blurring over the plurality of sample images, at page 55 section 6.4 with the teaching of fragments which are stored in the accumulation buffer, the fragments include RGB values of pixels; averaging the display feature over the plurality of sample images, at page 83 section 9.1 with the teaching of accumulating using glAccum(GL_ACCUM, .05f) which in OpenGL command syntax means accumulate (add 10 times) and multiply by the value (.05) giving .5, combined with the glAccum(GL_LOAD, .5f) which means load the scene and multiply by .5, the LOAD and ACCUM together totaling 1.0 giving

the mean (average) of the display feature over the plurality of sample images; and displaying the character in the frame with the averaged feature, at page 83 with the teaching of real-time animated sequence, which inherently requires display.

While McReynolds teaches most features claimed, it is noted that motion-blur for text characters is not explicitly taught. However, Des Jardins teaches this feature at figure 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use motion blur for text characters because moving objects, such as text used in title trails, produce smoky trails similar to the fading contrails following jet airplanes. The obviousness rationale is provided by Des Jardins at column 2 lines 20-23.

Claim 19 further requires the display feature is an RGB value of pixels in the plurality of samples. McReynolds teaches this at section 12.2 at pages 123-132.

Claim 22 requires the display feature to be a color model of pixels in the plurality of samples. McReynolds teaches the RGB color model at pages 123-132.

7. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McReynolds in view of Des Jardins as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Foley et al.

Claim 20 further requires the display feature to be an HLS value of pixels in the plurality of samples. While HLS is not explicitly taught at McReynolds or Des Jardins, Foley et al. teaches the HLS color model at pages 592-595. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use the HLS model for pixel values because it is easy to use. The rationale is provided by Foley et al. at page 594, first sentence.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The term "HIV" in claim 21 is used by the claim to mean "value of pixels", presumably in an HIV color model. However, no such color model is found in the prior art and the specification does not clearly define the term.

10. Claims 1-13 and 23-26 are allowed.

11. Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: With respect to claim 1, the prior art of record does not fairly teach the claimed "a form for entering a text", "one or more icons for representing behaviors for the text" and "the web server coupled to a text animation engine, the text animation engine including an object-oriented data structure for representing the text, such that the object-oriented data structure includes a plurality of objects, wherein each character in the text is represented by an object in the plurality of objects". With respect to claim 8, the prior art of record does not fairly teach the claimed "entering a text sequence into a form on the web browser", "each character in the sequence of characters is represented by an object in the plurality of objects", "displaying one or more icons on the web browser, wherein the one or more icons represent potential behaviors for the plurality of objects". With respect to claim 23, the prior art of record does not fairly teach the claimed "blurring the first character on the display, wherein the first character is blurred by a blurring function contained in the first object". With respect to claim 17, the prior art of record does not fairly teach the claimed "data structure is used as a default for a second font family" if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almis R Jankus whose telephone number is 703-305-9795. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman can be reached on 703-305-9798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AJ

ALMIS R. JANKUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER